```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                           DISTRICT OF NEVADA
 2
      BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. JONES, SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
                                ---000---
 3
 4
      MICHAEL ERWINE, an
      individual,
 5
                   Plaintiff,
                                   : No. 3:18-cv-461-RCJ-WGC
 6
              -vs-
                                    : May 14, 2019
 7
                                   : Reno, Nevada
      CHURCHILL COUNTY, a
 8
      political subdivision of
      the State of Nevada; et
 9
      al.,
10
                   Defendants.
11
12
13
                      TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
14
    APPEARANCES:
15
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
                               LUKE ANDREW BUSBY
                               Attorney at Law
16
                               Reno, Nevada
17
18
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
                               KATHERINE F. Parks
                               Attorney at Law
19
                               Reno, Nevada
20
21
2.2
    Reported by:
                               Margaret E. Griener, CCR #3, FCRR
                               Official Reporter
23
                               400 South Virginia Street
                               Reno, Nevada 89501
24
25
```

ENE, and that that settlement is enforceable, and that the

only condition to the settlement was Churchill County's

24

```
1
     agreement to remove certain documents from Mr. Erwine's
 2
     personnel file and that we have done so.
 3
                   THE COURT: He listed them, you've agreed.
 4
                   MS. PARKS:
                               Right. Every one, in fact, and that
 5
     was something that Mr. Erwine's former counsel stated on the
 6
     record before Judge Carry in April at a status conference we
 7
     had.
 8
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay.
 9
                               So that's the position of the
                   MS. PARKS:
10
     county. And we're good to go, we're ready to move forward
11
     with the settlement that we believe is binding.
12
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
13
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               Thank you, your Honor.
14
                   As a preliminary matter, I will be asking to
15
     show some documents that were filed under seal and have not
16
     yet been unsealed by the Court. We did file a motion to
17
     unseal the entire proceeding, and if the Court so grants we
18
     can just show everything.
19
                   THE COURT: Not yet.
20
                   I want you to tell me what you're talking about
21
     and why that would alter what I perceive, too, to be reaching
2.2
     of a settlement in front of a judge who approved.
23
                   MR. BUSBY: Your Honor, I would like to show you
24
     some terms in the mutual release of all claims, and because of
25
     this proceeding, insofar as it's open to the public, this
```

```
document was filed under seal, and it hasn't been unsealed, so
 1
 2
     I wanted to bring that to the Court's attention before I
 3
     showed it to everybody in open court.
 4
                   THE COURT: Does the County object?
 5
                   MS. PARKS:
                               I'm not sure what we're talking
 6
     about.
 7
                   THE COURT:
                               I'm not sure either. I don't know
 8
     what he's talking about.
 9
                   MR. BUSBY: Your Honor, I have a copy here of
10
     the mutual release of all claims.
11
                   This document was filed confidentially under
12
     seal by the County in its motion, and I'd like to address some
13
     terms in this document for the Court today, but we're in open
14
     proceedings today so I wanted to seek leave from the Court do
15
     that, to unseal this before I showed it to you on the record
16
     today.
17
                   THE COURT: You're not going to present it as an
18
     exhibit, right?
19
                   MR. BUSBY: No, I just wanted to point out some
20
     terms --
21
                   THE COURT:
                               Sealed documents -- I'm the judge,
2.2
     I'm certainly able to review sealed documents.
23
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               Indeed, your Honor.
24
                   THE COURT:
                               So you're not going to submit it as
25
     an exhibit.
```

```
1
     nonbinding was mentioned four times in total.
 2
                   THE COURT: Why didn't she ask for the agreement
 3
     of your client and of yourself? Why did she ask for consent
     to the agreement?
 4
 5
                   MR. BUSBY: Because there were several terms,
 6
     underlying terms, that were agreed to, but the -- the
 7
     agreement was that the nonbinding terms as of today as it was
 8
     described by the Court would be brought back once the
 9
     documents were agreed on and what the obligations were under
10
     this particular statute were agreed on as well, and that's at
11
     the transcript at page 4, line 16.
12
                   THE COURT: What does it say?
13
                   MR. BUSBY: And at page 3, line 19.
14
     specifically stated at the outset that the agreement was
15
     nonbinding as of today.
16
                   THE COURT: What does the transcript say? Not
17
     what you say, what does the transcript say?
18
                   MR. BUSBY: Your Honor, may I pull up the
19
     transcript?
20
                   THE COURT:
                               Sure.
21
                   MR. BUSBY: We did attach the transcript as
2.2
     Exhibit 1 to the -- our response in opposition to the
23
     defendant's motion, and at page 3, line 16, the Court
```

states -- this is at the outset of the recitation of the terms

of the agreement after the ENE.

24

2.2

copy of Nevada Revised Statute 239B.020, and what the statute deals with is what a public safety agency is, which is a law enforcement agency, is required to disclose in response to a request for information about a previous employee.

And the rationale behind the statute is self-evident. Law enforcement agencies need to know with a reasonable degree of certainty the background of the people they're considering hiring.

And the statute explicitly states that upon request, the agency shall provide information, including information under sub 2 which states the information that a public agency may request pursuant to subsection 1 includes, and if we turn to the applicable provisions here under G and H, a statement regarding whether the employer would rehire the applicant, and, if the employer would not rehire the applicant, the reasons therefor, and, if applicable, a record setting forth the reason the employment of the applicant was terminated and whether the termination was voluntary or involuntary.

Now, our reading of this statute is that this is an affirmative duty that's placed on a law enforcement agency when it receives a request for information. Therefore, in response to such a request, a public safety agency such as the Churchill County sheriff's office is required by the law to produce this information.

2.2

And it doesn't say what form it has to be produced in, it just says they have to tell them why, why the guy doesn't work here any more and whether you would rehire him and what caused him not to work there any more.

Now, the mutual release does attempt to address this issue by inserting specific provisions stating what Churchill County would say in response to certain kinds of requests for information from other law enforcement agencies, but on page 4 of 6 it does state that all the terms in this agreement are subject to other requirements under law or by legal process.

Now, Churchill County can't waive its statutory obligation to reveal information about a former employee by signing a settlement agreement. It can't change the terms of the statute under a settlement agreement. That's the primary issue that Mr. Erwine has with this, but there are --

THE COURT: It can if I order them to.

MR. BUSBY: Um --

THE COURT: I can order them, in compliance with a case filed in this court, and for reasons -- for purposes of settlement I can order them to -- I can order them to jump through hoops.

MR. BUSBY: Your Honor, that brings up the second problem that we have with this agreement which is, when you apply for a law enforcement position in the state of

2.2

Nevada, you sign something that looks like this, and this is attached to our complaint as Exhibit 8. It's a document -- document 1-8 in the court's record, and this is not confidential, this is filed publicly.

And whenever you apply for a law enforcement position, you have to sign one of these, and what this says is that we're going to do an investigation of your background, and you waive any right you have to discover any of the information that we obtain in the course of that investigation.

So Mr. Erwine can't really ask the question, okay, well, why didn't you hire me in the circumstance, why did my background cause you to make the decision not to hire me.

And at the end of the day after the application process is complete, what you receive is something that looks like this, and this is document number 1-13 in the court's record attached to our complaint as well.

This is a rejection letter that Mr. Erwine received from the North Las Vegas Police Department, and it is a letter to Mr. Erwine, and it cites why -- basically vaguely why they rejected him, and they say here character issues.

Well, Mr. Erwine is quite convinced that the character issues that they're describing in this letter relate to what happened to him at Churchill County, but he can never

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

discover whether that's the case or not because of the waiver he's required to sign when he applies for these jobs. So Mr. Erwine enters into this agreement. applies for another law enforcement position. He signs a waiver because he's required to do it as a prerequisite to He gets a rejection letter from the other applying. department in the state, and they cite issues that he's convinced have something to do with Churchill County, but because he's required to sign the waiver, he can never determine whether that's the case or not. Therefore -- and that's why I think in the ENE the door was left open for Mr. Erwine to explore the obligations under the statute. That's the term that was used by the Court in describing --THE COURT: You may not be able to discover from North Las Vegas Police Department, but surely, under your case

THE COURT: You may not be able to discover from North Las Vegas Police Department, but surely, under your case heading, in your settlement and a final order of dismissal, you can make that discovery in this case, can you not?

MR. BUSBY: As long as the case --

THE COURT: Did you violate our settlement agreement.

MR. BUSBY: As long as the case is open, your Honor, but by other terms in the settlement, he's waiving all past and future claims. So he could -- he would not -- there's no way in any possible universe that he could discover

```
whether Churchill County was actually abiding by the terms of
 1
 2
     the settlement.
 3
                   THE COURT:
                               I don't understand your answer to
     that. Even if the case is closed, he can move to reopen it
 4
 5
     for failure of Churchill County to comply with the settlement.
 6
                   MR. BUSBY: He'd never have grounds, your Honor,
 7
     because he would have to -- in order to do that, make an
 8
     affirmative showing of some fact, not just a rejection letter
 9
     from another department, of some fact that indicates that the
10
     information from that department came from Churchill County,
11
     and because of the waiver he's required to sign when
12
     applying --
13
                   THE COURT: Can't he discover and submit to
14
     Churchill County "give me any and all referrals or references
     or responses to references requests that you have made, " and,
15
16
     in particular, to the North Las Vegas Police Department?
17
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               I think in order to do that, your
     Honor, we'd have to have some basis for asserting a breach of
18
19
     the settlement agreement itself.
20
                   THE COURT:
                               I would say so, too, but here's a
21
     rejection letter.
2.2
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               I don't believe that would be
23
     sufficient, your Honor, and --
24
                   THE COURT: Why don't you ask me if it's
25
     sufficient.
```

1 MR. BUSBY: I would envision bringing something 2 like a breach of contract claim in the future, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Right. It would be something similar to a 4 MR. BUSBY: 5 breach of settlement claim in the future. 6 THE COURT: Right. 7 MR. BUSBY: That's what he would be required to 8 bring. And when I put myself in the position of actually 9 filing that, and filing something that would pass Rule 12 muster, I would have to make -- and Rule 8 muster, Federal 10 11 Rule of Civil Procedure 12 and 8, I would have to make some 12 kind of affirmative showing of an actual breach by Churchill 13 County of the settlement agreement. But it would be 14 impossible for me to make that, your Honor, because I would 15 never have a fact tying something like this to Churchill 16 County, or I'm left in a position --17 THE COURT: You know, what strikes me, sir, is 18 that you reached a settlement in front of the magistrate judge 19 on the record, we got consent of all parties, and now your 20 client wants something more. 21 He wants an admission from Churchill that they 2.2 terminated him for illegal reasons, and that's what you're 23 searching for so that you get a court judgment that that --24 that it's illegal. 25 You reached a settlement, you listed the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
documents you wanted deleted, they agreed. The only other
issue, as you said, was compliance with the Nevada statutes,
but you get that if you get a judgment of the Court, even if
the settlement isn't incorporated into the judgment. As long
as the order confirms the judgment, the settlement, you've got
grounds to reopen the case and say they haven't complied
either under contempt or breach of contract.
              So I'm not quite sure I understand what you're
really asking me for. You just don't want enforcement, and
what I'm leaning towards is because you don't like the
settlement you reached, you want more money or you want
admission by Churchill County that they were in the wrong --
              MR. BUSBY: Well, at the end of the day, your
Honor, vindication is what my client is ultimately after in
this case, and, if I may, your Honor, vindication is an
acknowledgment that he didn't do anything wrong when he worked
for Churchill County, and what he was accused of doing is not
the truth, and that has interfered --
              THE COURT:
                          Is that what he demanded in the
settlement discussion before Judge Carry?
              MR. BUSBY: Your Honor, unfortunately, I
wasn't --
              THE COURT: "I want vindication, I want
acknowledgment that Churchill County was in the wrong," did he
demand that?
```

```
1
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               I believe so, your Honor, but this
 2
     statute doesn't permit --
 3
                   THE COURT: Why did Judge Carry conclude the
     settlement, the ENE then? Why didn't they keep going on with
 4
     the ENE and asking against Churchill, "Can you give that"?
 5
                   MR. BUSBY: Well, I believe the way it was left
 6
 7
     was there were some material terms that were agreed to.
 8
                   THE COURT:
                               "We're coming back for another ENE"?
 9
                               That's possible, your Honor, but --
                   MR. BUSBY:
10
                   THE COURT: No, no. Is that what Judge Carry
11
     said, "You can come back for another ENE"?
12
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               The way Judge Carry framed it was
13
     there was supposed to be a negotiation between parties to take
14
     place within 30 days.
15
                   THE COURT: Outside her presence.
16
                   MR. BUSBY: Yes, your Honor.
17
                   And there was supposed to be a status report
18
     filed within 14 days of that expiration of that 30-day period
19
     indicating what was going on, but that was never filed, and --
20
                   THE COURT: Okay. Let me let you finish.
21
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               That was before I appeared in the
2.2
     case.
23
                   But the problem is the terms of the agreement
24
     itself also give Churchill County adequate wiggle room to
25
     state orally, in compliance with the statute, what really
```

2.2

happened with Mr. Erwine at Churchill County, and there's no way he could ever discover or affirmatively show a Court that that had actually occurred because of the waiver he was required to sign when applying for employment, which I believe is why the settlement was nonbinding.

He needed to look into this and think about it, and when he reviewed the terms of the proposed settlement agreement and reviewed the statute and consulted with counsel, yeah, there's some issues with this that aren't going to solve the problem in the case. That's why, in his mind, and the plain language of the Court, the agreement at the ENE is nonbinding.

Just addressing the two major cases on point, the *Pamplin* is a conditional settlement case, you know, if you pay me \$10, we'll settle the case. The \$10 is paid, the guy refuses to settle the case. That's pretty open and shut. That's not what's going on here.

This wasn't just a condition, this was further negotiations and determinations to be made in these two categories what documents were to be provided and obligations under the statute.

The *Doi* case basically just stands for the proposition that a complete settlement that's entered into the record orally by the Court is binding on the parties. That's not what happened here. If the Court says multiple times on

2.2

the record that the settlement is nonbinding, it can't be complete.

With that, your Honor, I'd glad to answer any questions you may have. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Please, from the County, be sure to cite to me portions of the transcript that suggest this is final and not just simply a nonbinding --

MS. PARKS: Absolutely, your Honor.

And I would say, too, before I move on from counsel's argument, in fact, the *Pamplin* decision that we cited in our brief, and it's attached as an exhibit, is exactly on point.

If you look at the transcript of the post ENE proceedings, and specifically at page 5, Judge Carry goes into a discussion about what the terms of the settlement were to be, and she says the following:

"And in this particular case, as I stated, this is a nonbinding settlement that is contingent on the following, that your attorneys, Mr. Guinasso and Ms. Parks, will meet within the next 30 days to determine which records shall be scrubbed or removed from your employment record and to discuss the specific obligations for the information that can be provided pursuant to NRS 239B.202. Do you understand

that, sir?

2.2

"MR. ERWINE: Yes.

"And that if they are unable to agree on any of those particular conditions or documents, that your attorney, as well as Ms. Parks, will file a joint status report under seal with the Court within 14 days of that particular meeting, and, together with that document, they will also file under seal any disputed documents to be presented to the Court. Do you understand that?"

"Yes.

"From that point the Court will then hold a hearing to determine whether or not the parties can reach agreement on the disputed documents. Do you understand that?

"MR. ERWINE: Yes.

"And, finally, if the parties and the Court are not able to agree, and the parties reach an impasse as to those particular documents that can and should be removed, or any of the requirements under the statute, that you will have the right, as will the defendant have the right, to withdraw from this settlement. Do you understand that, sir?"

And the Court goes on to set forth additional material terms that were agreed upon by all of the parties and

in open court.

2.2

So the only thing that was -- that made that settlement nonbinding on that particular day, your Honor, was the fact that there had to be an agreement over the documents to be removed, and there was no dispute.

Churchill County received a copy of the documents from prior counsel, "These are the ones we want scrubbed from the file," and we said, "Fine."

We provided a release of all claims that the Court I know has had an opportunity to review in draft form and said, "Here's the mutual release."

As I stand here, I believe that the mutual release complies with all of the material terms that were reached at the ENE. More to the point, your Honor, no one, not Mr. Erwine nor either of his lawyers, has ever said, "We'd like you to consider revisions to the mutual release of all claims to say the following."

So this settlement was binding. It was contingent upon the happening of an event. Churchill County satisfied the condition when we said, "Absolutely, we'll remove all of the documents requested from the file."

THE COURT: So what is this dispute about, please? What -- I don't want you to tell me what you believe occurred, but what do you believe plaintiff contends occurred constituting an unlawful termination, and what he wants

```
excluded, and whether or not Churchill County has bound itself
 1
 2
     to not disclose such?
 3
                   MS. PARKS: Well, and I think, your Honor, if
 4
     I'm -- if I'm --
 5
                   THE COURT:
                               The settlement provided for
     $10,000 --
 6
 7
                   MS. PARKS:
                               Correct.
 8
                   THE COURT:
                               -- from Churchill to plaintiff,
 9
     right?
10
                               That's correct.
                   MS. PARKS:
                   THE COURT: And, of course, certain
11
12
     nondisclosures and scrubbing records.
13
                   MS. PARKS:
                               That's absolutely correct, your
14
     Honor.
15
                   What came up during the ENE with respect to
16
     Chapter 239B.020 is the fact, as pointed out by counsel, that
17
     there is a statute that says if an employer such as Churchill
18
     County receives a request from a law enforcement agency about
19
     the background of a candidate, what the statute actually says
20
     in paragraph 1, which I think is very applicable here, it
21
     says,
2.2
                  "Upon the request of a public safety agency,
23
          an employer shall provide to the public service
24
          agency" -- public safety agency, excuse me --
25
          "information if available about an employee on
```

2.2

subject matters A through G." Excuse me, A through
H.

In this case, Churchill County agreed to the removal of every document requested by Mr. Erwine from his personnel file.

We also agreed on each and every way Churchill
County would respond to subsection 2 of that statute and the
information that would be provided to a prospective employer.

THE COURT: Delineate that a little bit. Give me an example of a document or harmful document that was to be scrubbed, and, number two, most importantly, tell me what Churchill County committed themselves to by way of nondisclosure.

MS. PARKS: Absolutely. The documents that were primarily in dispute, I believe, your Honor, although no discovery was done when we did the ENE, are documents of this nature. Mr. Erwine had notes, Mr. Erwine had -- there were documents in the file about Mr. Erwine conducting a semi-investigation of alleged wrongful conduct on the part of his fellow deputies, there were some documents in the file that related to that.

There was a memorandum in the file that related to his termination. He was allowed to voluntarily resign so there was a memorandum in the file about what led to his separation from employment.

2.2

Those documents were removed. Those documents will no longer exist. They won't exist to share with prospective law enforcement employers, and they will not be there.

So what -- in fact, Churchill County is committing itself to be very, very careful and putting itself out there to comply with this statute while entering into this settlement agreement.

There is not going to be negative information that remains in Mr. Erwine's personnel file to ever be shared with a prospective employer.

THE COURT: You committed yourself in the agreement to not disclose that to another agency.

MS. PARKS: That is correct.

THE COURT: And how and where?

MS. PARKS: Your Honor, that entire section is addressed at the very bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2 of the mutual release of all claims where it indicates that Churchill County would give a neutral recommendation to a prospective employer that would include the date on which employment began, the date on which it ended, compensation, and these terms are what is required by the statute to be provided, a list of the compensation Mr. Erwine was provided, a copy of Mr. Erwine's application for employment which Mr. Erwine submitted to the county and did not request be

```
1
     removed.
 2
                   THE COURT: Are you allowed to provide an answer
 3
     to the question whether he was terminated or resigned?
                   MS. PARKS: Well, what we intend to say is
 4
 5
     addressed there, and what we -- at the top of page 3, in the
 6
     event a public safety agency requests information concerning
 7
     the reason why Mr. Erwine was terminated, the county will
 8
     advise that Mr. Erwine's termination from employment was
 9
     voluntary. That is what will be said, and that is all.
10
                   THE COURT: And you believe you're committed to
11
     that.
12
                   MS. PARKS: Absolutely, absolutely.
13
                   THE COURT: And do you acknowledge that he would
14
     have the right to seek contempt or breach if you violated
15
     that?
16
                   MS. PARKS: Absolutely. I think if either party
17
     were to violate any terms of this mutual release, litigation
18
     could ensue, absolutely.
                   You know, if there are specific problems with
19
20
     respect to the mutual release language --
21
                   THE COURT:
                               I need to ask counsel about that,
2.2
     whether that satisfies him in light of your acknowledgment.
23
                   MS. PARKS:
                               Right.
24
                   THE COURT: But, more importantly, answer my
25
     first question -- well, I guess you've answered it. You've
```

```
1
     given me your answer as to whether Judge Carry said this is a
 2
     final settlement.
 3
                   MS. PARKS: Absolutely. And I didn't read the
     entire transcript, your Honor, it's not long, but each and
 4
 5
     every one of the terms of the agreement were gone over by
 6
     Judge Carry, not only with Mr. Erwine, but with my clients as
 7
     well, and --
 8
                   THE COURT: But she said nonbinding.
 9
                               She said nonbinding contingent upon
                   MS. PARKS:
10
     this event, and in the event the parties were unable to reach
11
     an agreement about the documents --
12
                   THE COURT:
                               They were supposed to come back.
13
                   MS. PARKS:
                               -- we were supposed to come back.
14
                   THE COURT:
                               And we didn't.
15
                   MS. PARKS: And we didn't.
16
                   And with respect to the idea, you know, that the
17
     parties were required to file some sort of status report that
     didn't happen within 14 days, that's because as far as
18
19
     Churchill County knew, there was never a disagreement.
20
                   But one of the other things that I find
21
     troubling about the fact that we are here talking about this
2.2
     motion to enforce settlement, trying to answer questions
23
     about, you know, what does Mr. Erwine really want here, also,
24
     your Honor, is that last week Mr. Erwine, through his
```

attorney, filed a motion for leave to amend to add new claims

```
1
     and a new party.
 2
                   I filed a separate motion requesting additional
 3
     time to respond to that which I'd like to raise at some point,
     but I think what's going on here is just Mr. Erwine has
 4
 5
     changed counsel and changed his mind.
 6
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
 7
                   Reply? The first question, I quess, is doesn't
 8
     that satisfy you?
 9
                   She's just acknowledged on the record that you
10
     can bring contempt or breach actions if she violates, and
11
     that's what she's committed to. She will not, in light of the
12
     statute and in light of the order, the final judgment order,
13
     she's acknowledged and committed on behalf of the county that
14
     you can bring an action if they violate.
15
                   MR. BUSBY: And, your Honor, we certainly
16
     appreciate that representation, but it reminds me of one of my
17
     favorite sayings in the law, which is theory and practice are
18
     the same in theory but not in practice. It's a great
19
     theoretical.
20
                   THE COURT: But you're here, you practice,
21
     you're here, you're in the real world, you're here.
2.2
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               We are, your Honor.
23
                   THE COURT:
                               In front of the person that would
24
     impose contempt.
```

MR. BUSBY: And we appreciate that, most

2.2

certainly, your Honor, and we appreciate the Court's power, inherent power, to enforce agreements like this.

But we have to place ourselves in Mr. Erwine's position in the future when he's stuck with another rejection letter that says that he has, you know, essentially ethical issues, and he has to, in order to bring a contempt action, figure out if it was Churchill County that created the record that led to that finding by another police agency.

And because of the structure of the statute -it's an unusual statute, as you often find in the context of
the rules applying to employment of peace officers, is that it
doesn't allow him to do that. There's no way he could have
the evidence in order to support a claim for such a finding by
the Court. So he's kind of stuck in this Catch 22 by virtue
of signing this agreement.

And another thing that really is problematic for him is that the settlement agreement contains a provision that says that if they're compelled by legal process to provide answers, they can. That undermines the whole premise that they won't otherwise answer questions about him, and there's a mutual nondisparagement agreement.

Now, the allegations in Mr. Erwine's complaint are quite serious. He was --

THE COURT: It's a whistle blower complaint.

MR. BUSBY: In essence, your Honor, yeah.

2.2

And after he was fired there were extremely damaging materials inserted into his employment record that have already been shared with at least eight other law enforcement agencies, materials that he was never given a chance to dispute or review before they were placed in his file.

He only found out about them after he was applying for these other jobs and kept receiving these rejection notices with things like, hey, character issues? What does that mean?

So the level of, you know, settlement agreement not only by its terms requires a certain level of trust that it's going to be followed through with, and if Mr. Erwine doesn't have the means, the practical means, to enforce this in the future, it's not worth anything to him. It doesn't solve his problem for bringing the suit.

On the record over and over again at the ENE it was stated that the agreement was nonbinding. A layperson hearing that over and over again stated by a judge is going to believe it's true.

The reasons for rejection are highly technical, legal, they involve the interaction of the statute on provisions of law related to the enforcement of settlement agreements, the terms of the settlement agreement itself, and when he had questions about it, they weren't satisfactorily

answered.

2.2

But his concerns about this are quite legitimate, and the Court --

THE COURT: Tell me what your position would be in filing of a motion for contempt or a breach, a complaint for breach, with respect to disclosures made by Churchill in response to reference requests before the settlement was reached? What would be your position on a motion for contempt?

MR. BUSBY: Well, our position --

THE COURT: In other words, if they sent portions of the record to other employment agencies, police agencies, what would be your position in the request for contempt? Do you have a remedy there?

MR. BUSBY: Well, that they violated the promise in the mutual release that they would remove the materials from his record and they wouldn't share disparaging information about him.

But there's no way he's ever going to know whether that happened. He doesn't have an open case in which he can issue a subpoena to Churchill County. He, by virtue of applying for a job like this, has to sign a waiver that says he can't get that information from these third-party law enforcement agencies.

And, in fact, during the course of this case I

```
1
     think subpoenas have been issued to six or seven of them, and
 2
     there may be an issue we might be bringing before the Court,
 3
     but they have -- you know, it's going to be a lot of work.
                   There's a lot of barriers there to seeking
 4
 5
     disclosure of that information in the context of a law
 6
     enforcement agency, and there's perfectly good legislative
 7
     policy rationale for those being in place, and a law
 8
     enforcement agency needs to have really wide discretion, they
 9
     need to know who they're dealing with, but Mr. Erwine needs to
10
     be able to defend himself as well, your Honor.
11
                   THE COURT: Okay. I'll take it under
12
     submission.
                  I'll issue an order forthwith.
13
                   MR. BUSBY: Thank you.
14
                   MS. PARKS: Your Honor, may I be heard on one
15
     other issue?
16
                   THE COURT: What other issue?
                   MS. PARKS: As I indicated, last week counsel
17
18
     filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint to add an
     additional -- an additional party and additional causes of
19
20
     action. Our opposition or response to that motion would be
21
     due tomorrow.
                   Yesterday -- and I haven't had a chance to talk
2.2
23
     with counsel about this, I filed a motion requesting an
24
     extension of time for us to respond to that for a period of
25
     14 days after the Court decides this pending motion. I'd like
```

```
1
     to save my clients the expense of having to respond to that
 2
    before the Court makes a decision on the motion.
 3
                   THE COURT: Well, that motion goes to Judge
 4
     Carry, right?
 5
                   MS. PARKS: Oh, I suppose.
 6
                   MR. BUSBY:
                               I believe it goes to Judge Cobb,
 7
     your Honor, but I'll represent --
 8
                   THE COURT:
                               Judge Cobb.
 9
                               I'll represent today, your Honor,
                   MR. BUSBY:
10
     that we have no objection to stipulating to the request.
11
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay.
12
                   MS. PARKS: Very good. Thank you, counsel.
13
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you so much.
14
                   The Court will issue an order, and thank you for
15
     your attendance.
16
                                  -000-
17
18
              I certify that the foregoing is a correct
              transcript from the record of proceedings
19
              in the above-entitled matter.
20
              /s/Margaret E. Griener
                                              7/16/2019
               Margaret E. Griener, CCR #3, FCRR
21
               Official Reporter
22
23
24
25
```